

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY OF ALAMEDA PLANNING BOARD
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2011

1. CONVENE: 7:08 p.m.

2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Kohlstrand

3. ROLL CALL: Present: President Ezzy Ashcraft, Vice-President Autorino, Board Members, Kohlstrand, Lynch, Wallis and Zuppan.
Absent: Board member Ibsen.

4. MINUTES:

Minutes from the Regular meeting of November 8, 201(Pending)

Minutes from the Regular meeting of January 10, 2011
Approved 5-0-1, Board member Wallis abstained.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:
None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Report

6-A Future Agendas

Staff presented an overview of upcoming planning project.

6-B Zoning Administrator Report

Meeting of 2-1-11-650 Haight Street-Tattoo Parlor-Approved

Meeting of 2-15-11-Canceled

Oral Report

None.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:
None.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:
None.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

9-A 2010-2011 Election of Planning Board Officers. The Planning Board will elect a new President and Vice President for the upcoming (remaining) year, as required by the Planning Board By-Laws
Continued until full Board present.

9-B Alameda Point Community Planning Update. The Planning Board will review and comment on recently completed and planned upcoming planning efforts for Alameda Point. The Board will also consider a draft resolution of support for the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority's Response to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's Request for Qualifications for a Second Campus at Alameda Point

Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager, presented an update of the Alameda Point Community Planning process. He reported that the City held three community workshops in the fall of 2010 at which residents, business owners, and other interested stakeholders from different neighborhoods considered prior plans and suggested new ideas for a plan for Alameda Point. The forums occurred on November 9, 2010 at the Grand Pavilion on Bay Farm Island, on November 18, 2010 at the Mastick Senior Center in central Alameda and December 8, 2010 at the Officers' Club at Alameda Point in West Alameda. All three forums were well attended (approximate 70-100 participants at each forum) and discussions were animated. In addition, over 165 workbooks were completed and submitted by forum participants. To supplement the community forums and provide a convenient additional opportunity for community participation, an online workbook was made available on the city website. The online workbook was open for public use from November 25, 2010 until February 1, 2011. Approximately 150 residents completed portions of the workbook on-line.

On February 8, 2010, staff held a forum for the businesses that are currently at Alameda Point. The purpose of the workshop was to solicit strategies and good ideas to build Alameda Point into a regional destination and job center. Approximately 30 business representatives attended the workshop. In addition, the City received approximately 11 responses to a questionnaire that staff sent to all businesses at Alameda Point. The tenants, many of which have been at Alameda Point for over 10 years commented that this is the first time they have been asked what they would like to happen with the development.

During the months of January and February 2011, the City's Boards and Commissions engaged in the process. The Boards and Commissions with primary responsibility for planning, transportation, economic development, parks and open space, and historic preservation participated in the process by each holding a public meeting to discuss the exercises within the workbook that were most relevant to their area of expertise. The Economic Development Commission, Historic Advisory Board, Recreation and Parks Commission and Transportation Commission all devoted meeting time to the planning effort.

Mr. Thomas reported that the community forums and online workbook provided a wealth of information about community priorities, preferences, and opinions. To document and organize this important information, staff is preparing a Summary Report for the community. The Summary Report will summarize in approximately 25 pages the information that staff received from the community at the various forums and meetings and the on-line workbook, and:

- Identify those elements, concepts, and proposals from past plans that the community generally agree should be included in a plan for Alameda Point,
- Identify those elements; concepts or proposals for which there is not agreement and that will require further, focused community discussion, and

- Highlight new ideas provided by the community.

The Summary Report which will include a 100 + page on-line workbook appendix will be finalized in March and presented to the ARRA in the first week of April.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that at the tenant forum representatives from St. George Spirits mentioned that they may be looking to lease the Bachelor's Officer Quarters (BOQ) to be used as a dormitory for their college distilling courses.

Mr. Thomas stated that most of the current leases at Alameda Point are short term.

Board member Lynch stated that currently regional sports facilities are very profitable and Alameda Point would be an ideal location. He also believes that the City should be cautious not to get into long term leases without structuring it in a way that if certain benchmarks are not met the lease can be broken.

Board member Wallis agrees that you do not want to secure long term leases in under utilized areas but set up a district.

Board member Kohlstrand commented that recreational uses are a very large topic in Alameda.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would not want to create an environment where only children with resources to pay for the private recreational facilities can enjoy them.

Vice President Autorino commented that he is please with the way update was presented reporting what people want and don't want. He believes that there will need to be trade-offs with the project such as "the cost of a soccer field equals the development of four additional houses".

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she would like to see a conceptual graphic showing what thousands of houses and other mixed uses would look at Alameda point. She also stated that she recognized a lot of the same participants at the Community Forums and suggested that possibly some of the subject matter forums could be held on the weekend to enable a different demographic to attend.

Board member Kohlstrand also stated that she is please with the update. She agrees that there need to be trade-offs. She feels that no one wants the development to be all housing and it needs to be mixed use and there needs to be a certain level of infrastructure in place. The infrastructure, housing, traffic and other land uses all have to work together and is not sure that separating it out is the best idea.

Mr. Thomas reported that in April the summary will be released to the public. He believes the question is how the City deals with all of the differences in opinion. The City has done years of work looking at the infrastructure and costing it out. The City needs to start by introducing the pro forma to the public and show the costs of the project. Certain repairs are non-negotiable such as the getting Alameda Point out of the flood plain, and replacing the

entire infrastructure. The City knows these costs and can list them, also the cost for sports facilities, and amenities. The revenue and expenditures for the project need to balance and the largest amount of revenue comes from residential land sales.

Board member Wallis warned that it could be difficult to explain the current revenue/expenditures and the projected long term revenue/expenditures. He suggested consolidating the information into scenarios. He mentioned that he was surprise to learn that approximately 32,000 people worked at Alameda NAS during its boom and wonders how different the traffic would be with a new development on the site compared to when the Navy was there.

Vice President Autorino suggested that you begin with a base that defines items as discretionary and nondiscretionary such as here are things that you have to do regardless of the cost. Need to educate the public of the magnitude of the cost and not over analyze it just get those items that need to be done off the table and concentrate on the issues that are controversial.

Mr. Thomas agreed stating that you start with a base-line pro forma with a built in number of housing units to get the project to balance. It may just be a project that works without all of the amenities that the community has said over the years they want and it may be that the cost for those amenities is additional housing. The community needs to understand the trade-offs to agree on a Master Plan for Alameda Point.

Board member Zuppan feels that it is important to make the information easy to understand for the public. She suggested there be 2-4 scenarios stating that any more than that makes it too confusing for everyone. You need to figure out what really matters and get a consensus on those choices and focus on those. The project needs to look at the impact the project will have in the area over the next 20-25 years and probably over that amount of time what the community wants will have changed.

Board member Lynch stated that the Treasure Island project in San Francisco would be a good example of the process needed and taken to bring a project to entitlement as it is almost completed. The project can act as a tangible object that residents can look to for information.

Mr. Thomas stated that City staff has been watching the progress of the Treasure Island and Hunter's Point projects.

Board member Kohlstrand stated that mixed use needs to include housing and by putting the uses closer together it reduces the cost of the infrastructure and lessens the need for cars thus reducing the green house gases. She feels that this issue needs to be kept in the discussion and is key to the design of the project.

Mr. Thomas stated that financial sustainability, city-wide transportation sustainability, environmental sustainability and community sustainability (jobs, affordable housing) are universally supported in the community. He stated that it would be helpful to grade each scenario on how they rank on the sustainability issues.

Board member Lynch asked what transportation sustainability refers to.

Mr. Thomas stated that he believes it means that the overall transportation system in the City is maintained and possibly improved.

Board member Wallis stated that the City needs to look at the current transportation network and is it at an acceptable level. Also there is a need to set sustainability goals for each category.

Mr. Thomas stated that the City needs to look at what sustainability in Alameda represents and set goals towards it that are feasible.

Board member Kohlstrand stated the need to look at the sub aspects of Transportation Sustainability and Environmental Sustainability such as how the buildings are developed or how to manage the transportation system and you can't separate it from the Transportation land Use which is the fundamental issue. She reiterated the need for mixed use development citing the congestion problems with Bay Farm Island/Harbor Bay Isle stating that when you separate the uses people will need their cars. Despite the abundance of walking and bike paths certain elements of the design make automobiles the primary use.

President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if the Board believes it would be best to combine the Financial Sustainability Workshop, Citywide Transportation Sustainability Workshop and the Environmental Sustainability Workshop or should they be separate. She worries that separating them might fragment members of the Community from one or more of the topics. She also stated that the information needs to be presented in a way that people understand.

Board member Zuppan suggested that the City look at doing an interactive Web seminar where participants can chat with each other, send post or questions to be answered during the seminar and also poll the participants regarding different issues.

Mr. Thomas stated that the idea is to hold the workshops separately due to the volume of information and that the workshops are not to make final decisions but to gain information to be able to come back with easy to visual alternatives. Mr. Thomas also stated that he thinks having a Youth Workshop would be a good idea to find out what the future generation of Alameda would like to see out at Alameda Point.

The Board members agreed that it would be interesting to get input from the younger generation.

Mr. Thomas reported that the City of Alameda is responding to a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) to be the site of their second campus. The response to the RFP is due on March 4, 2011 and the City is putting together a very comprehensive document. The land being proposed for the LBNL is 50 acres in the southern area of Alameda Point near the Maritime Administration (MARAD) Fleet. He stated it would be a great opportunity to bring jobs to Alameda Point with the LBNL

proposing 4,500 square feet of lab space employing 800 people in the first phase. The proposal requested documentation of Community backing for the project so the City is putting together resolutions in support of the project from different Boards and Commissions.

Board member Kohlstrand asked if it is going to be an open campus or a closed one.

Mr. Thomas stated that it will be an open campus.

Vice President Autorino asked what the possible problems with the proposal are.

Mr. Thomas stated that the City is hoping to get short listed at which time other possible stumbling blocks could be addressed. The proposal asked that the new site be within 25 miles distance from the gate of their main campus which could be an issue as the proposed site is very close to that limit. Another concern is acquiring the land from the Navy and the lack of infrastructure and amenities currently at and around the site.

Carol Gottstein, resident, encouraged the Planning Board members to carefully read the RFP that LBNL put out.

President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that she sees the addition of the LBNL campus as a game changer for the entire Alameda Point project. She encouraged the Planning Board to give a unanimous approval of the Resolution.

Board member Kohlstrand moved adoption of the resolution supporting the City's response to the Lawrence Berkley National Laboratory's Request for Proposal. Board member Lynch seconded the motion. **Approved 6-0.**

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:
None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

President Ezzy Ashcraft introduced Patrick Wallis, the newest member appointed to the Planning Board. Board member Wallis is a Facilities & Real Estate Portfolio Manager with the Coast Guard.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 9:16 p.m.